

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This response is being filed in response to the Office Communication dated December 10, 2008. In the Office Communication, the Examiner noted that the Reply filed on August 27, 2008 in response to the Office Action dated May 29, 2008 was not fully responsive because Applicants did not underline the term “comprises” in independent Claim 1 as a newly added term. In response to the Office Communication, Applicants are submitting the response filed on August 27, 2008 with the term “comprises” underlined in Claim 1 to indicate that this term is newly added. The Remarks/Arguments presented in the August 27, 2008 Reply are included below.

In the Office Action dated May 29, 2008, dependent Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as being indefinite for depending from a cancelled claim, and independent Claim 1 and dependent Claims 2, 5, and 7-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable in light of U.S. Patent No. 4,090,279 to Wasko in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,922,761 to Schwendt. The Examiner kindly suggested that dependent Claims 3 and 4 would be allowable if rewritten into independent form. In response to the Office Action, Applicants have canceled dependent Claim 4 and amended independent Claim 1 and dependent Claim 7. Following this response, independent Claim 1 and dependent Claims 2, 5, and 7-11 remain pending in the application.

A. Rejection of Dependent Claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. §112

Applicants have amended dependent Claim 7 so as to depend from independent Claim 1, as suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of dependent Claim 7 under §112 be withdrawn.

B. Rejection of Independent Claim 1 and Dependent Claims 2, 5, and 7-11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Applicants have amended independent Claim 1 to include the feature recited by dependent Claim 4, which the Examiner indicated was directed to allowable subject matter. Accordingly Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of

independent Claim 1 under §103(a).

Dependent Claims 2, 5, and 7-11 depend from independent Claim 1 and therefore include all the limitations of independent Claim 1 plus additional features that further define over the prior art. Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above in regard to independent Claim 1, Applicants respectfully assert that dependent Claims 2, 5, and 7-11 are also patentable over the prior art.

C. Conclusion

It is not believed that extensions of time or fees for net addition of claims are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 CFR § 1.136(a), and any fee required therefore (including fees for net addition of claims) is hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 16-0605.

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's careful consideration of this application and would welcome a telephone conference with the Examiner to expedite the processing of the patent application. Applicant's attorney, Meredith Struby, may be reached directly at (404) 881-4626.

Respectfully submitted,



Meredith W. Struby
Registration No. 54,474

Customer No. 00826
ALSTON & BIRD LLP
Bank of America Plaza
101 South Tryon Street, Suite 4000
Charlotte, NC 28280-4000
Tel Atlanta Office (404) 881-7000
Fax Atlanta Office (404) 881-7777

ELECTRONICALLY FILED USING THE EFS-WEB ELECTRONIC FILING SYSTEM OF THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE ON December 23, 2008.